Appl. No. 10/679,207
Amdt. dated Sept.27,2004
Reply to Office action of July 12, 2004

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Regarding the Claims; Since claims 1&2 were rejected and claims 3&4 were objected to, the entire claims were rewritten.

Regarding your reference to the Garman patent as being anticipated or prior art. After reading the patent and studing the drawings, it seems that some different terminology is used to describe his components. Garmans reference point 42 is termed a wear point, whereas this component is generally refered to as a tooth, tip or digging tooth. Some patents referring to a digging tooth and tip can be observed in U.S. Pat. No. 5,561,925 and U.S. Pat. No. 4,949,481 they are all the same components.

Garman's reference point 30 is termed tooth, where it appears this component should be termed as a bolt on tooth adapter, (not as a tooth), terminology is sometime confusing. It seems that all backhoe tooth adapters are a weld-on design and I refer to U.S. Pat. No.5,561,925 and U.S. Pat. No. 6,766,602 to observe weld-on tooth adapters.

Garman's reference point 32 is termed as a base edge protector and is mounted on the base edge. This component has no relation to the wear point (tooth or digging tooth). In Garman's drawings, FIGS. 1,2,3,4,5 and 14 clearly show the wear point as a standard digging tooth and there is no expansion in width or any other change that would make it (prior art) in relation to my Safety Teeth design.

Respectfully submitted,

Wendell L. LeBlanc

Wendell L. LeBlanc

PAGE 4/4 * RCVD AT 9/28/2004 2:53:03 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-1/2 * DNIS:8729306 * CSID:8062562309 * DURATION (mm-ss):02-00